

14418

Dear Nancy,

2/22/78

When Al has a chance to do some copying she will be copying some pages of ex. session transcripts we have obtained to replace pages from which names have been removed. I'll be enclosing them.

This reminds me that I've been intending to write you with a suggestion - that you make an FOIA request of the FBI.

There were news accounts of the FBI having the transcript of the session of 11/22/64. From all we know this should have been impossible because we were told that the stenotypist's tape was transcribed for me under FOIA, that it had never been transcribed before. Indeed, the court reporting records, which I've had for about a decade, confirm this - no write-up are its words. So how did the FBI have a non-existing transcript?

There appear to me to be but two possibilities: they made an under-the-table deal, with the court reporter, which would have been possible under a couple of conditions only, or they had the place bugged.

If the Commission confiscated the stenotypist's tape immediately they the court reporting firm had nothing from which to make a transcript - unless it also taped, which when I had experience- very extensive experience-with that firm it did not do. If it was an afterthought ~~not~~ to confiscate the notes then transcribing them would have been possible.

And the FBI would have known through its stoolies, Ford.

I suggest that you write a letter like this, addressed FBI Headquarters, Wash., D.C. 20535:

I am a college student writing a thesis on aspects of the work of the Warren Commission. News accounts report that the FBI had a transcript of the Warren Commission executive session of January 22, 1964.

This is my request under FOIA for a copy of that transcript and of all ~~related~~ records related to it and to its content.

Be sure to say FOIA request on the envelope and on the letter itself. It saves time. And their regulations ask for it.

Please send Jim or me a copy.

This can be of help to use in our suit for the transcripts, the missing ones. Jim filed the appeals brief Tuesday but there will be more briefing and there will be oral arguments.

I can't do this because they'll tell me that among those 60,000 pages I already have are all they have. That would get me nowhere.

Please also watch for me and I strongly suggest for yourself for all accounts of the Epstein book. This is relevant to the transcripts because of the basis for the denials of the past and of the denials of those of 1/21 and 6/23. In 6/23 there is "Nosenko. They claimed that he could even get killed if they let the transcript out. If you want their briefing on this let me know. Meanwhile, they have made him available to Epstein. I knew this without Epstein's name more than a year ago, from a reporter. And if you look at Barron's book KGB you'll find out that just about all the defectors were made available to him, including Nosenko. Who walked into his office with his bare face hanging out.

I believe you asked me about Nosenko before, in the sense of the current line about him. I do not credit this line, never did and believe the exact opposite. The spookeries just don't work that way. More, at the time of Nosenko's defection there was no need for the Russians to make the effort attributed to them in the defection. And if you read in Barron the damage Nosenko did you'll see it was an unnecessary and very high price-for nothing. Best to you both and apologies for the errors,